

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The arguments and amendments presented herein include the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during phone interview dated April 21, 2010. The Examiner requested Applicants to submit the discussed arguments and amendments for reconsideration, which Applicants present herein. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

Applicants submit that any amendment to the claims herein does not comprise acquiescence or admission that any canceled, amended or supplemented subject matter that existed prior to the amendments herein is not patentable. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claimed subject matter as presented prior to the amendments herein during subsequent prosecution of the present application and in any continuation or related applications.

1. Claims 1, 9-14, and 22-24 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 9-14, and 22-24 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Xu (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,581) and Crozier (U.S. Patent No. 5,392,390). (The Examiner misstated the patent number for Xu as 6,081,837 on pg. 2 of the OA11) Applicants traverse.

Amended claim 1 concerns providing information describing a file system connection between a local file system located on a local system and a host file system located on a host system, said method comprising: encoding a host system data structure comprising at least one tag representing the host file system; and encoding a mapping data structure comprising at least one tag representing a mapping between a file in the local file system and a file in the host file system and a transfer type that defines a data format for transferring data between the host system and the local system to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system, wherein the tags are in a metalanguage format, and wherein each tag has an identifier and a set of one or more attributes and wherein the encoded local system data structure, host system data structure, and mapping data structure forms a file system connection descriptor; and using the file system connection descriptor to access the host file indicated in the mapping data structure by using the mapping data structure to determine a pattern describing a host file

system type that maps to a local file system type, wherein the transfer type for the pattern defines how data is transferred between the host file having the determined pattern to a local file of the local file system type in the local file system.

During the phone interview, amendments were discussed to provide further details on how the mappings are used in order to advance prosecution. Applicants submit the amendments herein to provide such details to overcome the rejection. The added requirement of using the mapping data structure to determine a pattern describing a host file system type that maps to a local file system type, wherein the transfer type for the pattern defines how data is transferred between a host file of the host file system type having the determined pattern to the local file system in which the local file system type applies is disclosed in at least pg. 12, lines 10-29, pg. 16, lines 5-17, pg. 17, lines 1-8, pg. 19, lines 6-12, pg. 21, lines 8-18, p. 23, lines 9-15 of the filed Specification.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 6-20, col. 8, lines 57-64, and col. 14, lines 9-23 of Xu as teaching the claimed local system data structure, host system data structure, and mapping data structure as comprising tags in a metalanguage format forming a file system connection descriptor to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system. (OA11, pgs. 2-3) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 9 mentions that once a first data mover receives pointers to data to be accessed in the second file system, the first data mover communicates read or write data over the bypass path. The first data mover sends a read command and in response read data is returned over the bypass path. The first data mover transmits write data in a write command including pointers from the metadata received from the second data mover. The cited col. 8 mentions that metadata data refers to information about the data including locks upon files and file attributes including pointers to where data is stored. The cited col. 14 mentions that each client context is associated with one TCP network connection. In a system that forwards data access requests over TCP connections between data movers, the network will be jammed. To solve this, a limited number of open TCP connections are pre-allocated, and there may be additional fixed number of open TCP connections.

The cited Xu discusses transmitting pointers from metadata and how a first data mover accesses data using pointers from metadata. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in the cited Xu of tags in a metalanguage format for a local system data structure, a host system data

structure, a mapping data structure, and a transfer type. Instead, the cited Xu discusses metadata pointers used in read and write requests and how TCP connections are used. Nowhere does the cited discussion in Xu teach or suggest the claim requirements of a local file system data structure representing a local file system, a host file system data structure representing a host file system, and a mapping data structure between files in the local file system and files in the host file system, and a transfer type, where all these data structures comprise tags in a metalanguage format that form a file system connection descriptor. Further the cited Xu does not teach that these different local system, host system, and mapping data structures, and a transfer type are used to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system. Instead, the cited Xu discusses how the pointers are used to read or write data over a path.

The Examiner cited col. 4, lines 3-13 of Crozier as teaching the claim requirement that the mapping data structure comprises a transfer type that defines a data format for transferring data between the host system and the local system to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system. The cited col. 4 mentions a method for translating computer data from a source record structure to a destination record structure. A mapping is established between the fields of the two record structures by presenting the names of the fields of each of the record structures on a display, and allowing a user to specify the correspondence between pairs of field. The translation makes use of this mapping. This cited discussion of how to translate computer data between structures does not teach a data format used for transferring data to support remote editing of files as claimed. Instead, the cited col. 4 discusses a mapping to map fields from one data structure format to another

Neither Xu or Crozier teach or suggest the claim requirements of a local system data structure, host system data structure, and mapping data structure as comprising tags in a metalanguage format forming a file system connection descriptor to support remote editing of files in the host file system from the local file system. Further, the Examiner has not cited any part of the art that teaches or suggests that the mapping data structure has a transfer type that defines a data format for transferring data between the host system and local system to support remote editing.

Moreover, Applicants submit that the Examiner has not cited where the cited art teaches or suggests the added claim requirement of using the mapping data structure to determine a pattern describing a host file system type that maps to a local file system type, wherein the

transfer type for the pattern defines how data is transferred between a host file of the host file system type having the determined pattern to the local file system in which the local file system type applies.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art because the cited combination of Xu and Crozier does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 9-14 and 22-24 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. The following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amended claim 9 depends from claim 1 and further recites that the local file system type comprises a local file extension, wherein the mapping data structure comprises: a local file extension data structure storing the local file extension for each mapping and a host file pattern data structure storing the pattern for each mapping describing a host file to which the local file extension will be applied.

Claim 9 is amended to conform to the amendments made to claim 1.

The Examiner cited col. 10, lines 15-24 of Cozier as teaching the additional requirements of the pre-amended claim 9. (OA11, pg. 4) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claim 9.

The cited col. 10 mentions a mapping database to map address, line 5 to state and address line 6 to zip. Special coding handles the city and state pairing. These records are used by the translation process to map six subfields in the address field of each record to desktop fields in the target record.

The cited col. 10 does not teach or suggest a mapping having a local extension data structure storing a local file extension for each mapping, such that the host file pattern data structure stores the pattern for a host file system type to which the local file extension will be applied. Instead, the cited col. 10 discusses how to map database files to fields in a target record, not how to use a pattern to map a host file system type to a local file system in which the local file system type applies.

Accordingly, claim 9 provides additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the cited combination of references does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

2. Claims 22-24

The OA11 does not provide any examination of claims 22-24 that are pending in the Application. The Examiner did not cite any art as teaching the requirements of pending claims 22-24. Applicants request that the Examiner provide examination of these pending claims which have been incorrectly omitted.

3. Added Claims 31-50

Added claims 31-50 include the requirements of pending claims 1, 9-14, and 22-24 in system and computer program product form. The additional system and computer program product form requirements of these claims are disclosed in at least pg. 24 of the filed Specification.

Applicants submit that these added claims are patentable over the cited art and in condition for allowance because they substantially include the requirements of claims 1, 9-14, and 22-24, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1, 9-14 and 22-24 and 31-50 are patentable over the art of record. Should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: May 24, 2010

By: /David Victor/

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984